

Finally, let me point out that the bill does encourage reciprocity where it really counts in the context of this bill. By encouraging the use of U.S. fabric and U.S. yarn in the assembly of apparel products bound for the United States, the bill establishes a solid economic partnership between industry in the United States and firms in the beneficiary countries. That provides real benefits to American firms and workers in the textile industry by establishing a platform from which American textile makers can compete worldwide. That is precisely the benefit our industry most seeks in the context of our growing economic relationship with both regions.

In short, I oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do so as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 2484. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 348 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Abraham	Feinstein	Mack
Allard	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Moynihan
Baucus	Gorton	Murkowski
Bayh	Graham	Murray
Bennett	Gramm	Nickles
Biden	Grassley	Reid
Bingaman	Hagel	Roberts
Bond	Harkin	Roth
Breaux	Hatch	Santorum
Brownback	Hutchinson	Schumer
Bryan	Hutchison	Sessions
Burns	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (OR)
Conrad	Kerrey	Specter
Coverdell	Kerry	Stevens
Craig	Kyl	Thomas
Crapo	Landrieu	Thompson
Daschle	Leahy	Voinovich
DeWine	Lieberman	Warner
Dodd	Lincoln	Wellstone
Domenici	Lott	Wyden
Enzi	Lugar	
Feingold		

NAYS—27

Akaka	Edwards	Mikulski
Boxer	Helms	Reed
Bunning	Hollings	Robb
Byrd	Inouye	Rockefeller
Campbell	Johnson	Sarbanes
Cleland	Kennedy	Smith (NH)
Collins	Kohl	Snowe
Dorgan	Lautenberg	Thurmond
Durbin	Levin	Torricelli

NOT VOTING—2

Gregg McCain

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROTH. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2406

Mr. ROTH. At the request of the Senator from Wisconsin and with the approval of the senior Senator from New York, I ask that the yeas and nays be vitiated with respect to amendment No. 2406. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate conduct a voice vote on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to table amendment No. 2406.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROTH. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, under rule XXII, I yield my hour to the Democratic leader.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, under rule XXII, I yield my hour to the majority manager of the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, under rule XXII, I yield my hour to the minority leader.

Mr. COCHRAN. Under rule XXII, I yield my hour to the majority manager.

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield 50 minutes allotted to me to the senior Senator from New York so he may yield to the junior Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Under rule XXII, I yield my hour to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 900

Mr. ROTH. I ask unanimous consent the majority leader, after consultation with the minority leader, may proceed to consideration of the conference report to accompany the financial services bill and provide further that the conference report has been made available and the conference report be considered as having been read and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

I further ask that there be 4 hours equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member, an additional hour under the control of Senator SHELBY, 1 hour for Senator WELLSTONE, 30 minutes for Senator BRYAN, and 20 minutes for Senator DORGAN. I further ask consent that no motions be in order and a vote occur on adoption of the conference report at the conclusion or yielding back of my time without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROTH. In light of this agreement, there will be no further votes this evening.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROTH. I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOLUNTARY CONFESSIONS LAW

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise today to express my deep disappointment at the Justice Department's decision not to defend a law of Congress regarding voluntary confessions.

Last evening, the Justice Department responded to the petition for certiorari from the Fourth Circuit Dickerson case, which had upheld 18 U.S.C. Section 3501, a law the Congress passed in 1968 to govern voluntary confessions. The Department refused to defend the law, arguing that it is unconstitutional under *Miranda v. Arizona*.

This position should not be surprising. Earlier, the Clinton Justice Department had refused to defend the law in the lower Federal courts. It had prohibited a career Federal prosecutor from raising the statute to prevent Dickerson, a serial bank robber, from going free, and had actively refused to permit other prosecutors from using the statute. However, it had held out the possibility that it would defend the law before the Supreme Court. Indeed, prior to the time the Department was forced to take a position in the Dickerson case, the Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General had indicated to the Judiciary Committee that the Department would defend Section 3501 in appropriate cases.

The Attorney General's refusal to enforce the law puts her at odds with her predecessors. Former Attorneys General Meese, Thornburg, and Barr have informed me through letters that they did not prevent the statute from being used during their tenures, and indeed, that the statute had been advanced in some lower court cases in prior Administrations. They added that the law should be enforced today. During a hearing on this issue in the Judiciary Criminal Justice Oversight Subcommittee, which I chair, all the witnesses except one shared this view.

The position of the Justice Department is also contrary to the views of law enforcement groups, which believe that *Miranda* warnings normally should be given but that we should not permit legal technicalities to stand in the way of an otherwise voluntary confession and justified prosecution. Most recently, according to press reports, even Federal prosecutors urged Justice officials to defend this law. It was all to no avail. In my view, the Department has a duty to defend this law, just as it should defend any law that is not clearly unconstitutional. Each